DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 678 SP 007 618

TITLE	An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites.
INSTITUTION	Oregon State System of Higher Education, Monmouth. Teaching Research Div.
SPONS AGENCY	University of South Florida, Tampa. Leadership Training Inst. on Teacher Centers.
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	58p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Administration; *Educational Coordination; Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Teacher Centers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

To help national study groups and local site planners deal with issues concerning teacher centers, this paper explains some relevant critical points. These issues are grouped under various headings: a) the needs underlying teacher centers; b) their function, structure, administration and staffing; c) their program and financing; and d) their general application and viability. Under each heading, critical questions concerning teacher centers are presented to a) provide the reader with easy access to particular issues and b) provide the author with the flexibility to add or delete questions. These questions are designed to group issues under headings and present a list that could serve as a guide for organizing additional research on teacher centers. The questions in the report were settled upon after reviewing the literature on teacher centers and consulting a panel of knowledgeable local educators. (BRB)

ED 086678

An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites

1971

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

David D. Marsh
Project Director

Teaching Research
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Monmouth, Oregon

This study was conducted under a grant from the Leadership Training Institute concerned with Teacher Centers and Protocol Materials, B.O. Smith, Chairman.

SP 007 618

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

During the past several years the concept of Teacher Centers has captured the fancy of many who are concerned about the inservice and preservice training of school personnel. The rapid emergence of Teacher Centers as a topic of discussion across the country reveals the extent to which training is recognized as a critical need in the improvement of public school teachers.

More recently Teacher Centers have been discussed as being a part of a more comprehensive strategy of educational renewal that might include such functions as curriculum development, organizational change, the concentration of federal monies in a coordinated attack on school problems at a specific geographic site, and the delivery of educational research and development efforts to public schools. This configuration of functions has been labeled an Educational Renewal Site, which often includes a Teacher Center to carry out the training functions.

Reports from several national committees concerned with Teacher Centers have been a highly significant factor in explaining both the power of the Teacher Center concept and the speed with which it has been disseminated.[1] Among other things, these reports have outlined some essential ingredients of a Teacher Center, and have made sensible policy recommendations concerning their implementation. Yet many substantive issues remain to be solved and in many ways the viability of Teacher Centers depends on the quality of the resolution of these issues. Careful thought on these matters is needed both at the national and local levels.

---

[1]See National Center for Educational Research and Development, Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education, 1971; Smith et al., 1969; and Clark University Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes, 1970.

To help national study groups,[2] U.S. Office of Education officials, and local Teacher Center planning groups deal more effectively with the substantive issues, this project[3] seeks to make several contributions. Immediately following this introduction is a paper in which a number of critical issues concerning Teacher Centers are explicated. These issues are organized under the following headings:

1. The rationale for Teacher Centers
2. The functions of Teacher Centers
3. The structure and administration of Teacher Centers
4. The staffing of Teacher Centers
5. The program of Teacher Centers
6. The financing of Teacher Centers
7. The generalizability of Teacher Centers
8. The viability of Teacher Centers

Under each heading is an outline of the critical questions one might ask about Teacher Centers; questions in this case being synonymous with issues. The paper is left as an outline of questions because this format: a) provides the reader with easy access to issues he is especially concerned with and, b) provides the author with the greatest flexibility for adding or deleting questions over time.

The explication of questions is designed to group issues under headings and to give a rather exhaustive list of the issues. The paper will not

---

[2]This would include various groups and committees such as Consortium of Directors of Competency-Based Teacher Education Models, Vere DeVault, Chairman; Study Group of Leadership Training Institutes, B. O. Smith, Chairman; Subcommittee of Leadership Training Institutes, William Drummond, Chairman; A.A.C.T.E., Karl Masanari, Chairman.

[3]This is the final report for An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites, David D. Marsh project director. The study was conducted at Teaching Research, a Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, Monmouth, Oregon.

provide answers to the questions raised nor will it priorize the importance of the questions listed. Questions which the authors judged to be too narrow in scope or too situation specific were excluded.

The process by which these questions were generated involved three steps. First, an outline reflective of the principal clusters of issues concerning the concept of Teacher Center was created. Once the clustering of issues was determined/agreed upon, an exhaustive list of questions was developed for each major cluster or heading. Finally, the list was revised after a) reviewing the literature about Teacher Centers, and b) consulting with a panel of local educators knowledgeable about issues and concerns related to Teacher Centers.

The reason for undertaking the explication is severalfold. It is hoped that the paper can help new members of various national study groups, such as local Teacher Center planning groups, come to see the array of issues more quickly and with greater clarity. Hopefully each new group will not have to rediscover issues which previous groups have already recognized. It is also hoped that the paper will give a better order to these issues and will provide a means by which past experience can be brought to bear in resolving them. There is a tremendous need to collect the best available field experience and research data, and to make this information available to a wide audience.

The explication of issues paper can be used in a variety of ways:

1) It could serve as a catalogue of issues such that each new group (national committees, U. S. Office groups, local Teacher Center groups, etc.) does not have to rediscover the issues.

2) It could serve as a framework for organizing these issues in meaningful categories.

3) It could serve as a facilitator in focusing discussion on a given set of issues and, more generally, in communicating which issues are being addressed or not addressed.

4) It could serve as a way of organizing or retrieving information, materials and experience relative to various aspects of Teacher Centers.

5) It could serve as a guide for organizing additional research or study of Teacher Centers.

6) It could serve as a guide for planning a Teacher Center.

7) It could serve as a basis for documenting the efforts of various Teacher Centers as they are implemented.

While the potential users of the explication of issues paper play a number of roles in American education, the paper was written with two audiences in mind: members of national study groups concerned with Teacher Centers and Educational Renewal Sites, and planners of Teacher Centers at local sites. Some of the issues identified are more important for one or the other of these groups.

The wider audience of users might include:

1. Members of national [Teacher Centers] study groups, including members of Leadership Training Institutes
2. U.S. Office of Education staff
3. National organizations and groups (NEA, AACTE, etc.)
4. Groups funded to develop a Teacher Center at a local site
5. Groups funded to develop similar U.S. Office of Education programs, such as the Teacher Corps
6. Teacher educators and school personnel across the country

In addition to the explication of issues paper, there are several additional products which were produced during the project. For two sets of issues identified in The Explication of Issues paper, an attempt was made to gather the best available information which might help answer these questions. One of the papers focused on the issues of joint responsibility (parity) relationships within a Teacher Center, while the other paper focused on the issue of financing Teacher Centers. The

latter did not focus on the costs of Teacher Centers but rather on the amount of current expenditures for such items as inservice teacher education and the degree to which these resources could be redirected to a Teacher Center. Information on these matters was sought from experts in the area of school finance, the literature on school finance and from various summaries of information about inservice and preservice teacher education.

The paper on joint responsibility examined the experience of recent U.S. Office of Education projects such as the Triple-T program, the Teacher Corps, and the Urban/Rural program. It is assumed that these programs represent valuable lessons for those who seek to establish and maintain multi-institutional responsibility for the operation of Teacher Centers. The increasing desire of the professional associations and the community to be involved in the training of teachers makes this topic particularly important.

Finally, the project produced the raw beginnings of a library of documents relevant to the various issues identified in the explication of issues. Many of the documents deal explicitly with Teacher Centers or with the topics of the two supplementary papers of the project. It is hoped that additional efforts at establishing a library can be made in the months ahead.

The assistance of many people connected with the project needs to be acknowledged, especially so in light of the short timelines under which they operated. Ms. Mariya Futch coordinated the information gathering concerning joint responsibility and was given courteous help from numerous U.S. Office of Education staff and from the NEA and AACTE.

Ms. Diane Jones, Dr. Larry Dale, Dr. Glen Meredith and Dr. Edwin Strowbridge gathered information about financing Teacher Centers. Outside assistance from the Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon, the University of Wisconsin, the Bureau of Education Statistics and the NEA was greatly appreciated.

The assistance of Drs. Shelby Price, Bert Kersh, Jesse Fasold, Jerry Fletcher, John Parker, Clarence Kron and John Williamson made possible the organizing structure for the explication of issues. John Williamson was also a valuable advisor, critic and editor. Dean Pielstick and Diane Jones helped in the final editing and collating.

Bibliography

Clark University, Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes, Saul B. Cohen, Chairman. Training Complexes: Final Report. Worchester, Massachusetts, 1970.

National Center for Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education, Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education, Benjamin J. Rosner, Chairman. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education. USOE-NCERD Grant No. OOEG-0-71-2849. July, 1971.

Smith, B. Othaniel, Saul B. Cohen and Arthur Pearl. Teachers for the Real World. Washington D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Sections: The Needs Underlying Teacher Centers

The Functions of Teacher Centers

The Structure and Administration of Teacher Centers

The Staffing of Teacher Centers

The Program of Teacher Centers

The Financing of Teacher Centers

The Generalizability of Teacher Centers

The Viability of Teacher Centers

Note: At the beginning of the project, "teacher center" meant either an educational renewal site or a training component, as described in Teachers for the Real World, within a renewal site. To give coverage to the broader scope of issues, teacher center is used in both its meanings in this paper.

THE NEEDS UNDERLYING TEACHER CENTERS

This section is concerned with the identification and assessment of the underlying needs which provide a sound rationale for the establishment of Teacher Centers.

I. What are the social origins for legitimate needs?

A. What high priority educational problems can be effectively addressed through Teacher Centers?

1. The guarantee of equal educational opportunity for all children?

2. The redress of past educational deficiencies, particularly with respect to deficiencies due to economic and social deprevation?

3. The guarantee of continued professional and organizational growth and renewal in the schools?

4. The immediate delivery of the intellectual, technical and financial resources to the problems of schooling as they arise and are identified at the local level?

B. What fundamental social movements bear upon the desirability and viability of Teacher Centers?

1. The acceptance of cultural pluralism as a positive value in American society?

2. The increasing failures of isolated bureaucratic organizations to deal effectively with social change?

3. The changing trends in manpower needs in society?

4. The accelerating rate of technological and intellectual advance?

II. What historical/comparative precedents are there for Teacher Centers that give legitimacy to a rationale?

A. What previous educational movements have there been in this country analogous to Teacher Centers?

1. The laboratory schools?

2. The Regional Educational Laboratories?

3. The TTT experience?

4. What were the rationales for these movements?

5. What was the experience of these movements?

6. What are the lessons to be gained from these experiences?

B. What movements elsewhere in the world add insight into the need for Teacher Centers?

1. British Teacher Centers?

2. Japanese Science Centers?

3. What are the rationales for these movements?

4. What seems to be the experience of these movements?

5. What are the lessons to be gained from these movements?

III. What are the issues in judging the adequacy of the rationale for Teacher Centers?

A. Has the set of ideas contained in the notion Teacher Center withstood the basic questions by peers and professional colleagues such that the answers make sense to the critics?

B. Have the ideas underlying the Teacher Center been argued, interpreted and defended in relation to the best previous work that has been done on the subject?

C. Have the limitations of Teacher Centers been explained in terms of:

1. Situations or tasks where the Teacher Center is less than adequate?

2. Weaknesses of the Teacher Center notion even in the situations where it is considered viable?

THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section deals with the principal functions or purposes of Teacher Centers. It does not include consideration for how these functions might be carried out or who is responsible for their execution.

I. Should a Center have the function of development of all school personnel?

A. For whom would such training be?

1. Pre-service teachers?

2. In-service teachers?

3. Pre- and in-service for other professionals in the schools?

4. Paraprofessionals in the school?

5. University staff and others who help school staff (including school boards)?

B. Should the Center be concerned with:

1. Public schools only?

2. Other formal education institutions of the community (e.g., public libraries) which deal with young people?

3. Other learning environments to which the child is exposed?

4. The educational needs of adults and very young children as well as school age children?

5. Addressing priority educational needs of disadvantaged and minority groups?

C. Should a Center deal only with teacher training and leave other aspects of teacher education to other institutions?

1. What are the differences between teacher education and teacher training?

   a. In terms of definition?

   b. In terms of criteria for the differentiation?

2. To what extent could the role of the Center be delineated "before the fact" even if its purpose is only training?

3. Should the Teacher Center have responsibility for all the training aspects of a school staff?

4. If the Teacher Center had responsibility for all the training aspects of a school staff, then would pre-service training be assumed to come at the end of pre-service teacher education?

5. To what extent are problems that teachers have reducible to training and training only?

D. For what purpose is the training to take place?

1. To improve instruction through broadening and refining existing skills or development of new skills and/or teaching styles?

2. Self-improvement?

3. To allow others to make external judgments about the teacher's competency/performance?

   a. School district or other group for hiring/firing/promotion?

   b. Certification?

c. Granting of a degree?

d. Change of school program?

e. Community approval of teacher?

4. To provide alternative routes for entry into the profession?

E. For a given group, should training be directed at specific sub-groups which:

1. Teach certain subject matter?

2. Are part of a special program?

3. Have identified special needs/interests?

4. Deal with certain types of children (age group or special problem)?

5. Need remedial help of certain kinds (selected as individuals or groups who need help)?

F. What should training be about?

1. Interactive teaching skills only?

2. Subject matter?

3. Affective learning?

4. Instructional skills needed by school staff? (For example, curriculum materials development, evaluation of students' learning; skills in leading discussion)

5. All roles played by school staff? (This might include dealing with parents, counselling students and long term planning of the school program)

6. Could training be implanted without attention to curriculum development, etc.? Is this question particularly pertinent if the training is in support of a different role for that staff member or for a new type of school program?

II. Should a Center function to promote educational renewal?

A. What does local educational renewal mean?

1. In terms of definition(s)?

2. What are the limitations of the concept?

a. In terms of its scope?

b. In terms of its strengths and weaknesses?

B. Besides training, what would be included in local educational renewal?

1. Curriculum development/learning environment development?

2. Administration/organizational development?

3. Research/problem clarification?

4. Linking of local institutions?

5. Development of instructional materials/programs?

C. What general role would the Teacher Center play if it were involved in the items listed above (see B.)?

1. Train teachers and trainees to participate in these operations?

2. Share in the operations?

3. Give advice and assistance about problems and development?

III. Should a Center function as a delivery system for the products of educational research and development?

A. What is meant by "products?"

B. What is to be included in educational R&D?

C. What is meant by "delivery system?"

1. How is this delivery function related to:

a. Dissemination?

b. Diffusion?

c. Knowledge utilization?

2. Alternately, does a delivery system:

a. Implant?

b. Inform?

c. Modify/adapt?

D. What would be the role of Teacher Centers in applying a delivery system?

1. How would a Teacher Center complement or replace other delivery systems of education R&D?

a. Would the Teacher Center deliver only training materials?

b. Would the Teacher Center deliver teacher education materials?

c. Would the Teacher Center deliver other types of educational R&D materials?

d. Would materials be delivered with emphasis on areas with a scarce supply of materials?

e. Would the Teacher Center coordinate and focus the delivery of heretofore dispersed materials in a critical mass in order to achieve significant impact?

2. Does "delivery system" imply that Teacher Centers would market the products of educational R&D?

3. Should Teacher Centers be independent evaluators like Consumers Report?

4. Should Teacher Centers be the friend of local districts, universities in selecting and using educational R&D?

E. What role should Teacher Centers play in:

1. Helping regional labs, educational research groups, instructional personnel identify "consumer" needs? To what extent should Teacher Centers "interpret" these needs?

2. Preparing educational R&D products?

3. Influencing the packaging/availability of these products?

4. Reshaping the form/function of educational R&D efforts?

5. Maintaining a reservoir of information on new educational practices?

THE STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATION OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section is concerned with the physical and organizational structure of Teacher Centers as well as with their administration. Issues concerning the financial aspects of administration are raised in the section on finance.

I. What is the nature of institutional structure?

A. To what extent would the Teacher Center have a relatively separate identity as an institution as opposed to being thought of as a special set of relationships, linkages, or interfaces between existing institutions?

1. What are the alternative special relationships, linkages, or interfaces to:

a. Universities and colleges?

b. Public schools?

c. The people and agencies in the community?

d. Formal educational institutions in the community? (e.g. public libraries)

e. Professional educational organizations?

f. State departments of education?

g. Regional labs and other R&D agencies?

h. National agencies with established networks for disseminating educational R&D information and materials?

i. Publishing and materials development companies?

2. What are the institutional responsibilities of the Teacher Center: the university, public schools?

3. What is the relationship of the Teacher Center to the university and public schools in the community setting?

4. How will Teacher Centers obtain and maintain a position of prestige:

   a. With the university?

   b. With the public school?

   c. With the teachers themselves?

   d. With the professional associations/unions?

   e. With the community?

B. What are the alternative forms of legal status available for a Teacher Center?

   1. Would a Teacher Center have legal status and/or autonomy even if it were a member of an educational renewal network or complex?

   2. In what ways would any agreement between member institutions of a Teacher Center be in conflict with the "institutional sovereignty" of any member institution?

   3. Since many functions of member institutions have some legal basis of support, would institutions be asked to cede those functions and support duplicated by the Center?

C. What are the alternative forms of physical placement and structure available to a Teacher Center?

   1. To what extent would a Teacher Center need or want to have its own building?

   2. What facilities would be necessary or desirable to equip and operate such a building?

   3. What facilities from other contexts (such as schools, university campuses, state education departments, and the community at large) could be identified that might be utilized by the Center.

4. What factors would have to be considered in order to determine the location of a Teacher Center, i.e., population density within a particular area; accessibility of critical resources.

5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of locating:

   a. On a college or university campus?

   b. In a school building?

   c. In a separate building within a city or region?

II. What would be the nature of the administrative structure?

A. How would joint responsibility for the Teacher Center be established and maintained?

1. Which individuals or groups are to be involved in the joint responsibility for governing a Teacher Center?

2. How would individuals or groups be selected?

   a. By whom?

   b. By what means?

3. What would be the criteria for selection of individuals or groups?

   a. Pressure for representation by the funding agency (ies)?

   b. Traditional involvement of a particular group to matters with which the Center is concerned?

   c. Needed professional competence of a particular group (trainers or facilitators)?

   d. Representation by the Center's clients?

   e. Representation by persons directly affected by the operations of the Teacher Center?

i. What would be the criteria for judging a group to be directly or significantly involved?

ii. Who should represent groups that are directly affected, i.e., school children, but are unable to represent themselves?

4. What roles would be necessary to facilitate successful governing or policy making?

   a. What would be the role definition for a leader or director; a decision-maker; a resource person?

   b. What would be the functional relationships or liaisons among the specified roles?

   c. What is role of giving ideas to a policy group? Is that an independent role?

5. How would it determined who plays which role?

   a. By whom?

   b. By what means?

6. How would the role of the Teacher Center be determined as it relates to other members of the complex or consortium, including who holds the grant(s)?

   a. Political power?

   b. "Natural" authority (the articulate or the credentialed ones)?

   c. Designed interdependence? (e.g., specific roles assigned by the group that wrote the proposal)

7. By what criteria can policy issues (which might require community involvement) be separated from technical issues?

8. Is it imagined that cooperating groups would accept the distinction ... and related decisions?

B. Can the notion of "neutral ground" be implemented?

1. What is meant by neutral ground?

2. Where has it been successfully implemented?

C. What administrative procedures would be required of all Centers?

1. Systematic planning of a certain type?

2. Systematic information gathering and reporting -- internally and externally?

3. Systematic management, including discrepancy analysis?

4. PPBS or other budgeting systems?

THE STAFFING OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE STAFFING OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section is concerned with the selection, training, and utilization of the Teacher Center staff.

I. What should be the composition of the Teacher Center staff?

A. Having made some stipulations about the purposes and structures of Centers, what staff roles seem most plausible?

1. What would the job descriptions for these roles look like?

2. What generic sets of competencies can be identified for these roles?

3. To what extent would the Center staff be considered trainers of trainers?

B. What should be the selection criteria for staff?

1. To what extent should emphasis be given to hiring persons from minority groups?

2. To what extent should emphasis be given to hiring persons that are primarily practitioners; academicians?

3. Who would make the final decision in the selection of Center staff?

C. What would be the size and status of the Teacher Center staff?

1. Is it anticipated that there would be a large or small central staff?

2. Should the central staff be considered permanent, semi-permanent (2-4 years) over short-term?

3. Should the central staff be full-time or part-time?

4. What is the balance to be sought between staff coming from universities or colleges, schools, and the community?

5. Should the staff be considered "on-loan" or should it have its long term, primary identity with the Center?

6. What would be the status of those not on the central staff of the Center, e.g., professors who work closely with the central staff in the training of pre-service teachers in the school setting?

   a. Would they be considered to be a member of the Center's staff, even if they are paid by a university or school system?

II. What training is likely to be needed by the Center's staff?

   A. What form/format of training would be most efficacious for the Center's staff?

   B. Would any attempt be made to credential the Center's staff?

      1. Would it be desirable that this be done, even if it isn't possible at the present time?

      2. What are plausible means by which this could be done?

III. How can staff commitment to the purposes of the Teacher Center be maintained?

   A. What alternative commitments are likely to be a problem for staff from:

      1. Universities?

2. School systems?

B. How can the reward system be arranged so that the staff would remain committed to the Center?

1. Who would determine the nature of the reward system?

2. Would rewards be given by the Teacher Center itself or through the university and school system?

THE PROGRAM OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE PROGRAM OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section is concerned with the training model(s) and materials that are used in a Teacher Center, the issues of credentials, the relationship of training to school operation and career ladders, and the program of local educational renewal.

I. What training models and materials would be used in the Teacher Center?

A. Is there sufficient evidence about the relationship of teaching to learning to warrant a heavy emphasis in training in a Teacher Center?

1. What additional research is called for?

2. What additional training technology is called for?

3. How can the evidence about teaching and learning be meaningfully summarized for trainers in a Teacher Center?

4. How could clients trainees be helped to feel that thin evidence is important?

B. What training models would be used?

1. What types of training models are available (or should be created)?

2. To what extent would a Center be expected to use a variety of training models?

3. Are these models sufficiently developed to be useful in the setting of a Teacher Center?

4. Are these models conceptually adequate to the problems which Teacher Centers would address?

5. What would be the criteria for the selection of training models?

6. Would there be resources for development of new models?

7. Are there means of testing, evaluating, modifying, incorporating or combining various models?

8. Would there be resources for identifying and introducing models from other areas?

C. How useful are models of training/renewal taken from other fields?

1. The teaching hospital?

2. The county agricultural agent?

D. How would training materials be developed and adapted?

1. To what extent would training materials be developed locally at the Teacher Center Site?

2. What are the implications, both locally and nationally of an extensive amount of development of training materials at local sites?

3. Is it typical for local projects to modify protocol and/or training materials when these materials are used in local training projects? (Note: Modify might mean using only a part of the training package; reversing the presentation order of the materials; integrating the training materials with local training materials; and using a new training setting or timetable.)

4. Would it be desirable for projects to modify training materials?

5. Is there an adequate theory for adapting training materials to local settings? (Note: The theory would have to be able to deal with the issues mentioned in 3 above, among others.)

6. What procedural difficulties would keep Teacher Centers from adapting training materials to local needs?

7. Would Teacher Centers make extensive use of protocol and training materials developed outside the local site?

8. How could protocol and training be previewed by the local project before they are purchased/rented for use?

E. How would a needs assessment take place?

1. Whose conception of one's need would be used?

a. Needs of trainees as perceived by themselves?

b. Enlightened needs of trainees (after educating them)?

c. Needs of trainees as judged by others?

d. How would those needs be delineated, categorized, and prioritized?

2. What method of assessing needs would be used?

F. On what basis would training goals for teachers be established?

1. Research about teaching/learning, human relationships and interactions, needs?

2. Task analysis or output analysis of <u>current</u> school operation?

3. Judgment of experts about training needs of teachers?

4. Analysis of <u>desired</u> school environments, schools, or teaching roles?

5. Judgment of teachers themselves, especially in terms of daily classroom responsibilites?

6. Judgment of the community, especially parents?

G. Would these training goals be thought of in terms of:

1. Subjects teachers teach?

2. Affective learning?

3. Non-curricular interests and development of students?

4. Type of children and/or learning styles?

5. Types of learning sought in one by children? (e.g., concept attainment)

6. Instructional processes? (e.g., diagnosis)

7. Tasks of teachers?

8. Molar or molecular specification levels?

9. What blend of generalized vs. situation specific skills would be sought?

H. In what ways would the program be individualized?

1. By learning rates, styles?

2. By learning goals?

3. By individual school/district/regional programs or characteristics?

I. In what ways would the program be personalized, i.e., taylored to the needs and interests of individuals?

J. How can the training program gain the acceptance of teachers?

1. How can initial acceptance be gained?

2. How can teachers be encouraged in accepting community persons as trainers (in appropriate situations)?

3. Will teachers construe the purpose of the Teacher Center as indicating that they are incompetent? How can this feeling be overcome?

K. What pattern of incentives might be used?

1. Certification?

2. Salary increments?

3. Credit toward an advanced degree?

4. Negative incentives?

L. In what setting will training be conducted?

1. Laboratory setting only?

2. Laboratory and school setting?

3. School setting only?

M. What are the implications of such a training program for:

1. Facilities?

2. Staff?

3. Materials?

4. Access to Kids?

5. A school Classrooms?

6. Length of training?

7. Timing of training e.g., all at once, all prior to internship?

N. How would staff be freed so as to obtain this training?

1. Would it occur after the school day?

2. Would substitute teachers be used to free up teachers?

3. Would team teaching or other organizational procedures be able to free teachers during the school day?

4. Would school be dismissed on certain days?

5. Would teachers be trained during the summer months?

6. Would community acceptance be a major factor?

7. Would teachers be freed on an individual or group basis?

8. How would individuals or groups be selected?

9. Would non-teaching personnel be freed for training as well?

10. Would it be included as a part of the job?

O. On what basis would school children be made available?

1. How much time and when?

2. What renumeration, if any?

3. What protections will be built in to protect the child?

II. What credentials would the Center be responsible for?

A. Which credentials would be issued?

1. Entry to internship?

2. Completion of preservice training?

3. Entry to teaching in the state or school system?

4. Continuing as a teacher?

5. Various "master teacher" and specialty teacher roles such as team leader, evaluating specialist?

6. Supervisory or trainer?

7. Staff in other formal education institutions in community at entry or continuing level?

B. On what basis would credentials be issued?

1. A competency-based pattern?

a. State requires only that a program be competency-based?

b. State specifies competence categories only?

c. State specifies competence categories and how they must be met?

2. What group or coalition should make certification decision about individual trainees?

3. Should certification be left to groups or coalitions other than the Teacher Center?

a. To an independent certification board?

b. To the universities?

C. What are the competencies which would have to be met for a given level of credentials (See A above)?

III. How would training relate to teacher advancement and career ladders within the school system?

A. What are possible career ladders?

B. How could training at the Teacher Center relate to these ladders?

C. How could/should the Teacher Center relate to salary advancement/promotion within the school district?

IV. What is a local educational renewal program?

A. What would the specific programmatic focus be for the local educational renewal effort?

B. How could a Teacher Center help schools rethink their educational goals?

1. Are there models for how the Teacher Center could help schools rethink their educational goals?

2. What would the ingredients for such a model be?

3. What materials are available to help Teacher Centers carry out this effort?

4. Are there good examples of the way (form, comprehensiveness, and sophistication of statement) school goals and school programs might be described?

5. Where and how have articulated goals for schools been translated into meaningful and relevant guides to school practice?

C. What is the best current thinking about strategies and means to organize a school or school system to bring about educational renewal?

1. What is the best thinking about inquiry/interpersonal processes for renewal? What are the implications of this for Teacher Centers?

2. What is the best thinking about the politics of change in institutions committed to the status quo?

3. What methods are available for necessary attitudinal and value change to facilitate renewal?

THE FINANCING OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE FINANCING OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section deals with the various ways that Teacher Centers could obtain and coordinate resources as well as the projected costs of Teacher Centers.

I. How could current resources be redirected?

A. What public school resources might be redirected for use in a Teacher Center?

1. What amounts are being spent for inservice and retraining?

2. What amounts are being spent for curriculum development?

3. What amounts for research and evaluation?

4. What amounts for organizational renewal?

5. Which of these resources (questions 1-4 above) might be redirected for use in a Teacher Center?

6. Which of these resources (questions 1-4 above) might be made to serve a double purpose, i.e., used to support the Center while also serving their original purpose?

7. What kinds of resource reorganization or school reorganization might free up resources (dollars as well as in kind contributions) for Teacher Centers and Educational Renewal Sites?

8. What is included in costing of inservice?

a. Instructor/consultant salaries for inservice classes/workshops/seminars?

b. Administration/support salaries to operate the district inservice program?

c. Materials acquisition and development?

d. Equipment rental and purchase?

e. Travel and per diem?

f. Salaries for substitute teachers?

B. What university resources might be redirected for use in a Teacher Center?

1. What amounts are being spent for student teacher supervision? (university staff salaries only)

2. What amounts are being spent for methods courses and closely related teacher preparation courses?

3. What resources used to support research and evaluation, curriculum development, and training of public school and university staff could be shifted to the Teacher Center?

4. Which resources discussed in 3 might be made to serve a double purpose, i.e., used to support the Center while also serving their original purpose?

C. What resources of the professional education associations and unions might be redirected for use in a Teacher Center?

1. What amounts do these organizations spend for various types of inservice training?

2. To what extent might these resources be shifted to a Teacher Center or compliment the Teacher Center's effort?

D. What resources spent by teachers themselves could be redirected to the Teacher Center effort?

1. What amounts do teachers spend for graduate school tuition and other means of upgrading themselves?

2. What percent of teachers in a school district might be taking such training in a given year?

3. To what extent might these resources be shifted to a Teacher Center or compliment the Teacher Center's effort?

4. Many school districts reimburse teachers for graduate school study. To what extent could this money be used to support a Teacher Center?

E. What resources within state departments of education might be redirected to the Teacher Center effort?

1. What amounts do state departments spend for teacher education and certification?

2. What amounts do state departments spend for inservice teacher education? Are these funds specifically earmarked for this purpose?

3. What grants from the federal government provide funds that could be used for the various purposes of the Teacher Center?

4. What amounts do state departments spend for educational planning? Could the statewide plans for Teacher Centers be financed out of this money?

5. What increased amounts of dollars could state departments expect to have (for all of the above) over the next five years?

F. Summarizing from all the above, what are realistic projections of resources available for Teacher Centers from:

1. Redirected existing resources?

2. Newly generated resources?

3. Mutually benefitting resources?

C. What are the prospects of state legislation to support the Teacher Centers? (Consider state financial difficulties and opposition from education groups, teachers, schools, colleges, etc.)

II. How would the coordination of resources for Teacher Centers be handled?

A. How would federal money for Teacher Centers be coordinated within a state?

1. Would the funds be coordinated by the state department of education? a statewide coalition?

2. Would the funds to granted directly to local sites?

3. Would local grants go to school districts instead of universities or coalitions of institutions?

4. What are the implications of various funding patterns:

a. For local project operation?

b. For statewide coordination?

c. For U.S. office operations?

d. For other Teacher Center-like operations in the state? (that aren't federally funded)

B. How would finances be handled in regional or location Teacher Centers?

1. Would federal funding go a given institution or a coalition of institutions?

2. How would local institutions invest in the Teacher Center?

a. Informal agreement to contribute?

b. Formal agreement to contribute?

c. Shares purchased?

C. What state or local regulations would control the way funds must be spent, e.g., federal funds to the State of Oregon may not be used for out of state travel, without special approval from the state, even if the federal money is earmarked for this purpose?

III. What federal funds might be available for Teacher Centers?

A. What amount of discretionary funds are immediately available (assuming political approval) for Teacher Centers? What amount of discretionary is projected to be available over the next five years?

B. From which federal programs would this money come?

C. What are the legal constraints on how this money can be spent?

D. What new federal legislation would be useful?

E. What new federal legislation would be possible?

F. What dollar amounts might be provided by new legislation?

G. What guidelines should be used for funding and monitoring Teacher Centers?

H. The U.S. Office typically seeks to fund local sites for a limited period of time (3-5 years) after which the project is to be supported by local funds or absorbed into the operations of local institutions. Over what time period is it assumed that local Teacher Center sites would be funded?

1. In the last 5-10 years, what reasons account for why federal programs have been discontinued at local sites?

   a. The project has been successful and has been absorbed by local institutions?

   b. The specific project has not been successful and is not refunded?

   c. The federal project has ended?

2. Is the assumption that few federal programs have terminated local projects following the pattern given in II supported by the evidence?

3. Is there a pattern in the type of federal program which local institutions have been willing to continue once federal funding is discontinued?

4. What type of federal programs have they been most unwilling to continue?

5. Can any useful generalizations be made about these matters?

6. What patterns are projected in these matters, i.e., is it reasonable to assume that local school districts will be unable to support any new federal program? (sizable local contribution, in dollars, or continuance of the program after federal funds are withdrawn)

I. What is the likelihood of permanent federal financing either for Teacher Centers directly or as block grants to the states? What are the implications of block grants for Teacher Centers?

J. Is there any evidence that big cities will receive any more funds under the Teacher Center project than they did under the various B.E.P.D. programs previously?

1. What are the political consequences if B.E.P.D. programs concerning handicapped children are construed to have come to an end?

2. If these B.E.P.D. programs haven't really come to an end, yet Teacher Centers per se are to have these funds too, what is the likely result:

   a. In terms of constraints on spending the money?

   b. In terms of operational problems for the Center?

   c. In terms of truly serving various client groups?

IV. What are the anticipated costs of a Teacher Center?

A. What are reasonable projected costs, over a five year period, for these major components of a Teacher Center:

1. Inservice training of a specified type?

2. Pre-service training and internships?

3. The linking functions of Centers to bring about educational renewal?

4. Curriculum library and development assistance?

5. Research and evaluation?

6. Administration, facilities, policy making?

7. Technological and other support systems?

B. What are the most expensive setting up costs? Maintenance costs?

V. What is the discrepancy between the current resources available (both federal and local resources) and the projected costs for Teacher Centers?

A. What is the nature of the discrepancy for each of the major thrusts of the Teacher Center?

B. What are the implications of these discrepancies for the planning of Teacher Centers at the national or state levels?

1. Fund fewer sites?

2. Fund fewer functions?

THE GENERALIZABILITY OF TEACHER CENTERS

THE GENERALIZABILITY OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section deals with issues concerning the variability in Teacher Centers across states and the diffusion process by which Teacher Centers influence educational practice both locally and nationally. It also deals with the network of Centers that might be established in a state or region. Stated differently, this section is concerned about the extent to which Teacher Center will look the same and the extent to which achievements of Teacher Centers can be generalized to other contexts.

I. What would be the sources of variability between Teacher Centers?

A. What variables would be within the project?

1. Function variables?

2. Structural and administrative variables?

3. Staffing variables?

4. Program variables?

5. Finaacial resource variables?

B. What would be the local context variables? (e.g., nature of local school district, type of minority population being served)

C. To what extent would variation between Teacher Centers be by design?

1. What are the most important variations to study?

2. Which group might coordinate this experiment?

D. Are there any necessary features of either Teacher Centers or Educational Renewal Sites?

1. Are these process features?

2. Are these focus or structural features?

3. Are these features to be thought of as highly likely, highly desirable or absolutely necessary?

4. Are these features necessary because of:

   a. The intellectual integrity of the concepts?

   b. The federal guidelines for funding?

II. To what extent would Teacher Centers within a state or region be organized into horizontal or vertical networks?

A. What horizontal differentiation of Teacher Centers is possible?

B. How would the Centers communicate and/or share resources?

C. Would a Teacher Center be associated with a specific mutually exclusive geographic region?

D. What would the purposes be of vertically differentiated Centers?

   1. Policy coordination?

   2. Training of trainers?

   3. Research and evaluation?

   4. Materials and information coordination?

   5. Technological support?

E. How would such networks of Centers be:

1. Structured and administered?

2. Staffed?

3. Financed?

F. What are existing or hypothetical models for how this network might operate?

G. What are the advantages and disadvantages of networks of Centers?

H. What types of networks seem best suited for what types of conditions?

I. What role could/should a state department of education play in this network?

1. A large university?

2. An educational R & D center?

III. What national networks of Centers or support systems are needed?

A. What roles might network or support system have?

B. How should existing national systems be related to local or state Teacher Centers?

C. Could a resource base other than federal funding be established for a national system(s)? What might such networks cost?

D. How might such national networks or systems be managed?

E. What are the dangers or potential unintended outcomes of such a national network or system?

IV. How would the achievement of Teacher Centers be disseminated?

A. What are the types of achievements that might be disseminated?

1. Trained personnel?

2. Training programs and procedures?

3. Training materials, goal statements, and assessment instruments?

4. Curriculum materials and organizational structures for schools?

5. Processes or linkages for conducting training and educational renewal?

6. Research in various of these achievements?

B. What groups would have responsibility for diffusion at the national level? local level?

C. What are the critical assumptions about how change does/should take place in schools? What are the critical assumptions about how change can have spin off to other schools? to universities?
(Note: Assumptions might deal with: timing, resistances, mechanisms, target groups, changes to be delivered.)

D. How valid are these assumptions? Assuming our assumptions are inadequate, what is a more adequate theory of educational change and renewal?

E. What are criteria for making dissemination successful?

1. The information has been given out?

2. The change has been considered by others?

3. The change has been adopted or adapted by others?

THE VIABILITY OF TEACHER CENTERS

This section deals with the evaluation of aspects of Teacher Centers and with issues of accountability. It deals with resistances anticipated (its initial viability) as well as prospects for renewing the purposes and structure of Teachers Centers over time.

I. How will aspects of Teacher Centers be evaluated?

A. How could formative evaluation be used?

1. What are useful models of formative evaluation?

B. In what ways could summative evaluation be used?

1. Training materials, training models and training procedures?

2. Outputs?

a. At which of Turner's criterion levels?

b. In terms of impact on school system or university?

C. Will third party evaluation be required?

D. What national level evaluation could/should be undertaken?

1. What evaluation is deemed to be absolutely necessary? Why?

2. What evaluation is desirable given moderate resources?

3. In terms of conducting the evaluation:

a. For what purpose?

b. By whom?

c. When? How often?

d. How?

E. How will the Teacher Center obtain, store and retrieve data?

II. In what ways should a Teacher Center be accountable?

A. What are possible conceptions/models of accountability for Teacher Centers?

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?

2. For what should the Teacher Center be accountable?

3. To whom should the Teacher Center be accountable?

4. What accountability do other groups have to the Teacher Center? How will this be assessed and controlled?

B. What conditions, within the Teacher Center, are critical contingencies for accountability?

C. How will accountability be assessed and administered?

1. Will "strict" accountability be practiced from the beginning or will a Center ease into it?

III. What resistances could a Teacher Center encounter?

A. From various groups:

1. Universities?

2. Public schools?

3. Teacher groups?

4. Community?

5. State departments?

B. What are useful strategies for overcoming these resistances?

IV. How can Teacher Centers be renewed over time?

A. What is the evidence that the conceptual integrity of the Teacher Center will/will not disintegrate over time?

1. At the national level?

2. At local projects?

B. How will new ideas from the field (either conceptions of Teacher Centers or exemplary practice) be studied and disseminated?

C. How will national level thinking be continued?

1. Is a strategy for coordinating the research and development of Teacher Centers? What? By whom?

2. Is a nationally coordinated training program and technical assistance program needed? (for local project staff)

a. About what?

b. When?

i Before funding?
ii Before beginning of the grant?
iii During the grant?
iv Afte/the grant? (i.e., helping them complete the changeover o local funding)

c. Coordinated by whom?

3. Are national study groups needed?

a. What issues should they pursue?

b. What other activities should they undertake?

4. How should communication be handled?

D. Should it be assumed that Teacher Centers will be viable for a set period of time and then reconsidered or phased out?

1. What is the predicted life time of the Center:

   a. Program?

   b. Structure?